

Quantum two level systems and Kondo-like traps as possible sources of decoherence in superconducting qubits.

Lara Faoro¹ and Lev B. Ioffe¹

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University,
136 Frelinghuysen Rd, Piscataway 08854, New Jersey, USA*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We discuss the origin of decoherence in Josephson junction qubits. We find that two level systems in the surrounding insulator cannot be the dominant source of noise in small qubits. We argue that electron traps in the Josephson barrier with large Coulomb repulsion would give noise that agrees both in magnitude and in temperature dependence with experimental data.

PACS numbers: 85.25.Cp, 03.65.Yz, 73.23.-b

Despite remarkable experimental breakthroughs of recent years [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], the realization of quantum computer based on Josephson elements remains far away because developed circuits do not satisfy the stringent requirements on the amount of allowed decoherence imposed by the quantum computation. Thus, it is crucial to identify (and possibly eliminate) the microscopic origin of the noise in these devices.

It is commonly believed that the most important source of noise, at least for smaller qubits, is the fluctuations of the electric field generated by the environment that are usually described in terms of the effective charge induced on a superconducting island. Recent experiments performed on single electron transistor (SET) and superconducting qubits provide an almost complete characterization of the charge noise power spectrum as follows.

At low frequency ($f < 10^3$ Hz) the charge noise spectrum of $Al - AlO_x - Al$ SET shows a $1/f$ dependence: $S_q(\omega) = \frac{\alpha^2}{\omega}$ with intensity $\alpha = 10^{-3} - 10^{-4}e$ [9, 10, 11]. This level of the low frequency noise agrees well with the observed dephasing (free induction decay) in superconducting qubits [3, 4, 7]. Because its effect is greatly reduced by echo techniques [5], it is commonly believed that $1/f$ noise does not extend above $f_M \sim 1$ MHz. Recently, the direct measurements [12, 13] of the temperature dependence of the $1/f$ -coefficient have shown the T^2 -dependence observed previously in different setups [14, 15]. At high frequencies ($f \gtrsim 1$ GHz) the spectrum and the decay rate of the excited state of the superconducting qubits indicate the presence of a few quantum two level systems (TLSs) strongly coupled to the qubit [3, 16] superimposed on the Ohmic power spectrum [16]. Noteworthy, the crossover frequency between the high frequency linear noise and the interpolated low frequency $1/f$ noise is of order of T , which suggests the same physical origin of the low and high frequency noise [16].

In this Letter we discuss two microscopic mechanisms that might be responsible for the charge noise. First, we consider the effect of weakly interacting TLSs hosted

in the amorphous material surrounding superconducting islands. We prove that this environment provides a significant source of decoherence but the detailed characteristics of its noise power spectrum are in qualitative and quantitative disagreement with the data; in particular, the observed T^2 dependence of α^2 requires unphysical density of states of TLSs [17]. Second, we discuss the effect of Kondo-like traps located inside the insulating Josephson contact. We show that these traps behave similarly to weak Andreev fluctuators. [18]. We argue that for realistic parameters these traps produce noise very similar to the one observed experimentally.

Quantum TLSs model. It is well established that TLSs dominate the low temperature behavior of most amorphous materials at low temperatures [19, 20, 21]. One usually assumes that these TLSs correspond to atoms that tunnel between two positions. Although their exact microscopic origin is not known, it is well established that they are well described by a pseudospin characterized by dipole moment $\hat{p} = \vec{p}\sigma^z = e\vec{d}\sigma^z$ and controlled by the Hamiltonian $H_0 = E\sigma_z + t\sigma_x$. Here E is the energy difference between the two minima, t is the tunneling between them and those are distributed according to:

$$P(E, t) = \frac{\nu}{t} \quad \frac{\nu e^2 d^2}{\epsilon} \sim 10^{-3} \quad (1)$$

where $\nu = 10^{20}/cm^3 eV$ is the typical density of states of TLSs, d is the atomic distance and ϵ denotes the dielectric constant of the medium. Different TLSs interact with each other via dipole-dipole interactions:

$$H_{int} = \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\hat{p}_i \hat{p}_j - 3(\hat{r}_{ij} \hat{p}_i)(\hat{r}_{ij} \hat{p}_j)}{4\pi\epsilon r_{ij}^3} \quad (2)$$

where r_{ij} is the distance between the i^{th} and j^{th} dipole. Notice that the effective strength of the interactions is given by the dimensionless parameter (1) and is always very weak. This, for instance, implies that the effective field that other thermally active dipoles produce on a given one is small compared to the temperature. This small fluctuating field has, however, an important effect

on the coherent dynamics and is responsible for the low frequency $1/f$ noise, as we show below.

In order to estimate the coupling between a TLS and the qubit we notice that, in the charge basis of the qubit, its two states are characterized by the electrostatic potential operator $\delta\mathcal{V}\sigma_{qub}^z$ and thus produce electric fields that differ by $\delta\mathcal{E} = \delta\mathcal{V}/L$ at the position of the dipole, leading to the qubit-dipole interaction $H_{d-qub} = \delta\mathcal{E}\hat{p}\sigma_{qub}^z$. The characteristic length L is determined by the dipole position: it is of the order of the barrier thickness, 3 nm , for the dipoles in the barrier or $L \approx 500\text{ nm}$ for the dipoles in the surrounding insulator. The resulting effect on the qubit is conventionally described as the induced charge $\delta Q = \kappa e \sigma^z$ where the coupling constant $\kappa = p/eL \sim d/L$. Note that the coupling constant with the dipoles in the barrier is rather large, $\kappa \sim 10^{-1}$.

Because the interaction term between the dipoles is small, it is convenient to work in the basis that diagonalizes the Hamiltonian H_0 . In this basis $H_0 = \sum \Delta E_j \tau_j^z$ where $\Delta E_j = \sqrt{E_j^2 + t_j^2}$. The interaction between the dipoles has two effects: it causes level broadening ($1/T_2$) and it gives each level a finite decay time even in the absence of phonons; we consider these effects in turn. We begin with level broadening. For this calculation we can neglect the back reaction and assume that dipoles fluctuate independently. In this approximation each dipole is subjected to the effective field $h(t)$ generated by surrounding independent TLSs:

$$H_{int}^{eff} = \sum_i h_i(t) (\cos \theta_i \tau_i^z - \sin \theta_i \tau_i^x) \quad (3)$$

$$\langle \langle h_i^2 \rangle \rangle = \sum_{j \neq i} k_{ij}^2 \cos^2 \theta_j \frac{1}{\cosh^2 \beta \Delta E_j} \quad (4)$$

where the coupling $k_{ij} = \frac{\vec{p}_i \vec{p}_j - 3(\hat{r}_{ij} \vec{p}_i)(\hat{r}_{ij} \vec{p}_j)}{4\pi\epsilon r_{ij}^3}$. Averaging (4) over the distribution (1) we obtain the typical level broadening: $\gamma \approx \left(\frac{\nu p^2}{\epsilon}\right) T$. As expected, the dephasing level broadening is always much less than the temperature. Note that this estimate assumes a significant total number of thermally activated dipoles; this condition might not be satisfied in the thin Josephson barrier.

The relaxation rate γ^1 of dipoles is due to phonon emission or to the excitation of another dipole. The rate of the former decreases very rapidly at low energies $\gamma^1 \sim \Delta E^3/\omega_D^2$ where $\lambda_D \sim 10^2$ and becomes very low ($\sim 1\text{ ms}$) for $\Delta E < 50\text{ mK}$. The latter process dominates at very low temperatures. The time average of the relaxation rate of a given dipole can be found from Fermi Golden Rule:

$$\gamma_i^1 = \sum_j' \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta E_i - \Delta E_j)^2 + \gamma^2} |k_{ij}|^2 \sin^2 \theta_i \sin^2 \theta_j \quad (5)$$

This neglect of the higher order terms in the interaction can be justified if the dipole-dipole interaction is weak

compared to the line width ($|k_{ij}| < \gamma$): more strongly coupled dipole pairs form new effective dipole modes and thus have to be excluded from the sum which is indicated by prime. Averaging (5) we get for thermally excited dipoles: $\gamma_i^1 \approx \sin^2 \theta_i \left(\frac{\nu p^2}{\epsilon}\right)^2 T$ [22].

As explained above, the effect of the fluctuating dipoles on the qubit is characterized by the induced charge noise spectrum:

$$S_q(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \delta Q(t) \delta Q(0) \rangle e^{i\omega t} = (\kappa e)^2 G(\omega). \quad (6)$$

with correlator $G(\omega) = \sum_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \langle \sigma_z^i(t) \sigma_z^i(0) \rangle e^{i\omega t}$.

At high frequency the correlator is dominated by the resonant dipoles giving

$$G(\omega) = \sum_i \sin^2 \theta_i \frac{\gamma}{(\omega - 2\Delta E_i)^2 + \gamma^2} \quad (7)$$

By substituting (7) into (6) and by averaging over the probability distributions we get

$$S_q(\omega) = \left[\left(\frac{\nu p^2}{\epsilon} \right) \frac{\epsilon V}{e^2 L^2} \right] e^2 \quad (8)$$

where V is the volume of the amorphous insulator.

We conclude that the fluctuating dipoles give white noise spectrum at high frequencies. To estimate the noise level we first check that the amount of amorphous substance is sufficient to provide a large number of thermally activated TLSs. In real qubits, TLSs are located in the barrier or in the surrounding oxide. For the barrier we estimate $V \approx 10^7 \text{ \AA}^3$, so that the dipole density of states is about $0.1/K$. Clearly this is not enough to give a continuous spectrum and we must conclude that the barrier can contribute to the charge noise at high frequency by providing only few TLSs, strongly coupled to the qubit; this might at most account for resonance peaks. The situation is different for the surrounding oxide which has volume $V \gtrsim 10^9 \text{ \AA}^3$, in this case the number of thermally activated TLSs might be sufficient to produce a continuous spectrum of relaxation times with $S_q(\omega) \approx 10^{-6} e^2 K^{-1}$. Experimentally, the linear high frequency noise and the low frequency $1/f$ noise both extrapolate to the same value $\sim 10^{-6} e^2 K^{-1}$ at $\omega \sim T \approx 120\text{ mK}$ [16]. This value is very close to our estimate showing that the TLSs might provide a non-negligible source of noise at these intermediate frequencies.

At low frequencies the noise is dominated by thermally excited dipoles that behave as classical fluctuators at frequencies less than their relaxation rates:

$$G(\omega) = \sum_i \cos^2 \theta_i \frac{2\gamma_i^1}{\omega^2 + (\gamma_i^1)^2} \quad (9)$$

The relaxation rates γ_i^1 have a wide distribution, $P(\gamma) \sim 1/\gamma$, producing upon averaging, $1/f$ noise:

$$S_q(\omega) = \left(\frac{\nu p^2}{\epsilon} \right) \left(\frac{\epsilon V}{e^2 L^2} \right) \frac{T}{\omega} e^2 \quad (10)$$

Its linear temperature dependence is a direct consequence of the constant density of states that results in a linear dependence of the number of thermally activate TLSs: $n_{TLS} = \frac{T}{W} \rho_0 V$ where $W \approx 1 \text{ eV}$ is the energy scale of the disorder and $\rho_0 = 10^{20}/\text{cm}^3$ is the bare density. Similarly to the high frequency noise, this noise is of the right order of magnitude at lowest temperatures but grows linearly with temperature instead of following the T^2 dependence. Moreover, the phenomenological assumption that the number of thermally active dipoles is $n_{TLS} = \frac{T^2}{W^2} \tilde{\rho}_0 V$ has an other problem: the observed value of $1/f$ noise at low frequency implies that the total density $\tilde{\rho}_0 = \frac{W}{T} \rho_0 \approx 10^6 \rho_0$ is much larger than one per atom. Thus, in order to account for the data, one needs a physical mechanism characterized by a small energy scale W .

Kondo-like traps model. A natural candidate for the small energy scale is the superconductive gap Δ . In the bulk of superconductor all electron states are gapped and low energy electron traps seem unlikely. It is very likely, however, that numerous electron traps appear in the insulator at the SI boundary, with energies distributed in a broad energy range. The Coulomb repulsion between two electrons in the same trap is very strong prohibiting double occupancy. In the absence of such repulsion, the effect of the electrons hopping from one trap to another and their hopping via Andreev process would give the correct frequency and temperature dependence [18], but requires an unphysical density of states of these traps, similar to the TLS discussed above. The strong on-site repulsion leads to a formation of a weak Kondo-like resonance at the Fermi surface and provides the desired low energy scale. This physics is described by $H = H_d + H_{sd}$, where H_d and H_{sd} describe the Hamiltonian of the Anderson-like traps and of the coupling between the quantum impurities and the superconductor:

$$\begin{aligned} H_d &= \sum_{i\sigma} \epsilon_d^0 c_{di\sigma}^\dagger c_{di\sigma} + U \sum_i n_{di\uparrow} n_{di\downarrow}, \\ H_{sd} &= \sum_i \sum_{k\sigma} \left(t_{ki} c_{k\sigma}^\dagger c_{di\sigma} + h.c. \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here $n_{di\sigma} = c_{di\sigma}^\dagger c_{di\sigma}$, $c_{k\sigma}^\dagger$ ($c_{di\sigma}^\dagger$) is the creation operator of a conduction (localized) electron and U is the on-site repulsion energy. In the absence of superconductivity, the Kondo effect [23] leads to the appearance of the resonance at the Fermi energy with width $T_K^i = \Gamma_i \sqrt{\frac{U}{2\Gamma_i}} \exp \left[-\pi \frac{\epsilon_d^0}{2\Gamma_i} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon_d^0}{U} \right) \right]$, where $\Gamma_i = t_i^2 \nu_{Al}$ and ν_{Al} is the density of states in the Al . This resonance is only weakly affected by the superconductivity if $T_K \gg \Delta$. In this case, the ground state of the system (impurity plus superconductor) is a singlet and contains even number of electrons, while the first excited state is localized with the energy $\epsilon_K \lesssim \Delta$. In the opposite limit $T_K \ll \Delta$ the trap is always occupied, the ground state is a doublet and contains odd number of electrons. Because

the full Hamiltonian does not mix states with different parity, as a function of T_K/Δ a singlet and doublet level should cross at $T_K^* \approx \Delta$. Numerical studies confirm this and give the value $T_K^* \approx 0.3\Delta$. Close to this value we expect that the energy of the excited state varies linearly:

$$\epsilon_K = \mathfrak{P} (T_K - T_K^*) \quad T_K^* \approx 0.3\Delta \quad (12)$$

with $\mathfrak{P} \sim 1$. Thus, the electron traps characterized by $T_K \sim T_K^*$ provide a density of localized states at very low energy. Since the Kondo temperature depends exponentially on the energy ϵ_d^0 of the magnetic impurity, the density of these low energy states is

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\epsilon) &= \rho_0 V \int_0^\infty dp(\epsilon_K) \delta(\epsilon_K - \epsilon) \\ &= \rho_0 V \int_0^\infty \frac{dT_K}{T_K} \delta(\mathfrak{P} (T_K - T_K^*)) = \frac{\rho_0 V}{\mathfrak{P} T_K^*} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where ρ_0 is the bare density and V is the volume of the insulator barrier that contains traps. The density of these states is much larger than the one of the traps without on-site repulsions. However, their effect on the qubit is not so large because it is compensated by a small weight of the Kondo resonance $w = T_K/\epsilon_d^0$.

The charge of the qubit produces different electrostatic potentials on the traps, so electrons/holes tunneling between them causes the qubit decoherence. We distinguish fast processes in which electrons move a short distance $r < \xi$ which are responsible for high frequency ($\omega > T$) behavior of $S(\omega)$, and exponentially slow ones where the distance is large $r \gg \xi$ (ξ is the coherence length of the superconductor). If the size of the contact, l , is small ($l \ll \xi$), the relaxation might be dominated by tunneling from the traps inside the Josephson barrier to the one in the surrounding insulator that has much larger volume; however for a typical contact $l \sim \xi$ we shall ignore the distinction between the traps in the barrier and in the insulator nearby. In order to estimate the contribution of the fast processes, we compare it with the one of TLSs (8). There are two important differences: first, at a given frequency ω any pair of traps that differ by ω in energy can play the role of the two level system if one of these traps is empty and another is occupied; so the density of states of these pairs is $\omega \nu^2(\epsilon)$. Second, the effective dipole moment of the pair contains the additional small factor, w : $\tilde{p} = wea$ where a is the typical distance separating the trap from the superconductor. Combining these factors we get

$$S_q(\omega) = (w \frac{a}{L})^2 \left(\frac{\rho_0 V}{\mathfrak{P} T_K^*} \right)^2 e^2 \omega \quad (14)$$

The electron tunneling amplitude falls off exponentially for traps separated by distances larger than ξ leading to the logarithmic distribution of long relaxation

times: $dP(\tau) = d\tau/\tau$. Neglecting the logarithmic dependence of the insulator volume contributing to the slow dynamics we estimate the number of thermally active pairs by $(T\nu(\epsilon))^2$. The dipole moment corresponding to this transition is *wea*, so we get $S_q(\omega) \simeq \frac{\alpha^2}{\omega}$ with

$$\alpha \approx \kappa w e \left(\frac{\rho_0 V T}{\mathfrak{P} T_K^*} \right) \quad (15)$$

As expected, the linear frequency dependence at high ω translates into a T^2 -dependence of the low frequency power spectrum. Assuming, as before, that $V \approx 10^7 \text{ \AA}^3$, $\rho_0 \approx 10^{-3} \text{ \AA}^3$ and $w \approx 10^{-4}$ we estimate: $\alpha \approx 10^{-2} - 10^{-3} e$ for $T \sim 100 \text{ mK}$ [24]. We conclude that these fluctuators, although very weak, compensate their weakness by their large number, providing a value for the intensity of the $1/f$ noise in reasonable agreement with the experiments. Furthermore, they give the correct dependence of the noise power at low and high frequency. Notice that the electron moving in and out of the trap has also a large effect on the Josephson current if this trap is located in the Josephson contact, so these fluctuators might be responsible also for the noise in the critical current fluctuations as observed in [3].

In order to estimate the upper cutoff, Λ , for the $1/f$ noise we compute the tunneling amplitude between two traps separated by distance ξ located in a box of size ξ . In the absence of Coulomb repulsion on each trap, the transition amplitude between two traps with energy ϵ reads: $A = \sum_{\alpha} \frac{t_i \psi_{\alpha}(i) \psi_{\alpha}(j) t_j}{\epsilon - \epsilon_{\alpha}}$. Assuming that the wavefunctions of the electrons of the superconductor are random we find the tunneling amplitude $|A|^2 = \Gamma^2 / \nu_{Al} \xi^3 \Delta$. The on-site repulsion changes the energy, ϵ , of each trap to (12) and replaces $\Gamma \rightarrow T_K^*$ giving

$$|A_0|^2 = \frac{T_K^{*2}}{\nu_{Al} \xi^3 \Delta} = \delta \frac{T_K^{*2}}{\Delta} \quad (16)$$

where $\delta \equiv 1/(\nu_{Al} \xi^3)$ is the average distance between the levels in the box. For a typical *Al* island $A_0 \approx 10^{-2} T_K^*$, which is smaller than experimental temperatures. For a typical aluminum island ($\Delta_{Al} \approx 200 \mu\text{eV}$) we estimate $A_0 \approx 10^8 \text{ Hz}$. In fact these processes involve energy transfer to a thermal mode, so $\Lambda < A_0$.

Conclusion. We have discussed two possible microscopic mechanisms responsible for the charge noise in qubits. We found that for realistic values of the parameters, the conventional TLSs in the insulating Josephson barrier cannot provide a significant source of decoherence for small qubits, although they are likely to be the dominant source of noise for large junctions [3]. The TLSs in surrounding insulator might provide a significant source of noise at $\omega \lesssim T \sim 100 \text{ mK}$, but would give frequency independent $S_q(\omega)$ at large ω and linear T -dependence of the $1/f$ noise. We considered the effect of Anderson-like traps in the Josephson contact and found that quasiparticle hopping between these traps provides noise of the

right order of magnitude with the correct temperature and frequency dependence. In order to test this mechanism one needs to develop a more detailed analytical theory for the maximal rate of the thermally activated hopping between the traps and for the effect of the magnetic field that suppresses the superconductivity and compare these predictions with the data.

We thank B. L. Altshuler, O. Astafiev, G. Blatter, D. Geshkenbein, Yu. Pashkin and J. S. Tsai for useful discussions. This work was supported by NSF DMR-0210575.

-
- [1] I. Chiorescu, P. Bertet, K. Semba, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, *Nature* **431**, 159 (2004).
 - [2] I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, *Science* **299**, 1869 (2003).
 - [3] J. M. Martinis, S. Nam, J. Aumentado, and C. Urbina, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 117901 (2002).
 - [4] Y. Nakamura, Y. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature (London)* **398**, 786 (1999).
 - [5] Y. Nakamura, Y. A. Pashkin, T. Yamamoto, and J. S. Tsai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 047901 (2002).
 - [6] Y. A. Pashkin, T. Yamamoto, O. Astafiev, Y. Nakamura, D. V. Averin, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature (London)* **421**, 823 (2003).
 - [7] D. Vion, A. Aassime, A. Cottet, P. Joyez, H. Pothier, C. Urbina, D. Esteve, and M. H. Devoret, *Science* **296**, 886 (2002).
 - [8] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R. S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **432**, 162 (2004).
 - [9] E. H. Visscher, S. M. Verbrugh, J. Liendeman, P. Hadley, and J. E. Mooij, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **66**, 305 (1995).
 - [10] G. Zimmerli, T. M. Eiles, R. L. Kautz, and J. M. Martinis, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **61**, 237 (1992).
 - [11] A. B. Zorin, F. J. Ahlers, J. Niemeyer, T. Weimann, H. Wolf, V. A. Krupenin, and S. V. Lotkhov, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 13682 (1996).
 - [12] Yu. Pashkin and O. Astafiev, (private communication).
 - [13] F. C. Wellstood, C. Urbina, and J. Clarke, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **85**, 5296 (2004).
 - [14] F. C. Wellstood, Ph.D. thesis, University of California-Berkeley, 1998.
 - [15] C. J. L. M. Kenyon and F. C. Wellstood, *J. Appl. Phys.* **88**, 6536 (2000).
 - [16] O. Astafiev, Y. A. Pashkin, Y. Nakamura, T. Yamamoto, and T. J. Tsai, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 267007 (2004).
 - [17] A. Shnirman, G. Schön, I. Martin, and Y. Makhlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 127002 (2005).
 - [18] L. Faoro, J. Bergli, B. L. Altshuler, and Y. M. Galperin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 046805 (2005).
 - [19] J. L. Black and B. I. Halperin, *Phys. Rev. B* **16**, 2879 (1977).
 - [20] A. L. Burin, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **100**, 309 (1995).
 - [21] L. S. Levitov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 547 (1990).
 - [22] The typical relaxation rate contains one more power of $\nu p^2/\epsilon$.
 - [23] J. Kondo, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **32**, 37 (1964).
 - [24] Unlike the situation for the TLSs, the coupling coefficient

$\kappa = a/L \lesssim 1$ for the electrons, because their tunneling amplitude is much larger for a given a .